

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on June 30, 2008. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the foregoing amendment in light of the following remarks.

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action mailed on June 30, 2008, Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0186400 to Matsueda (hereinafter referred to as "Matsueda") (claim 10 was addressed on page 7 of the Office Action). No other issues were raised.

Status of the Application

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-2, 6, 8 and 10 will have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-10 remain pending in the application.

Rejection of Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Matsueda

In the Office Action of June 30, 2008, claim 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Matsueda. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a printing apparatus having, *inter alia*:

"a receiving unit configured to receive, from an information processing system, **a request for canceling the print job** received by the printing apparatus" (emphasis added);

“a determining unit configured to **determine whether the print job specified in the request received by the receiving unit still exists in the printing apparatus**” (emphasis added); and

“a responding unit configured **to transmit response information indicating that the request for canceling the print job has been received** to the information processing system before cancellation of the print job specified in the request is completed **in a case where the determining unit determines that the print job specified in the request still exists in the printing apparatus,**” (emphasis added) and **“to transmit error response information** to the information processing system **in a case where the determining unit determines that the print job specified in the request does not exist in the printing apparatus**” (emphasis added).

Thus, the printing apparatus as claimed is capable of receiving a request for canceling a print job, determining whether the specified print job still exists in the printing apparatus (e.g., whether or not the print job has already been printed), and depending on whether or not the specified print job still exists in the printing apparatus, transmitting either information indicating that the cancellation request has been received or error response information.

Accordingly, it can be understood that the claimed printing apparatus may thus allow a user to know that the printing apparatus has received a request for canceling the print job, before cancellation of the print job is completed, as a response to the request, in the case where the print job specified in the request still exists in the printing apparatus. Furthermore, in the case where the print job specified in the request does not exist (e.g., when the print job has already been printed), the user can also be informed to that effect. More specifically, although the printing process cannot be canceled if the print job has already been performed, because the printing job no longer exists in the printing apparatus, the

user can at least be notified that the print job has already been performed by the printing apparatus.

The printing apparatus of claim 1 is not anticipated by Matsueda because Matsueda does not teach or suggest providing a printing apparatus having a determining unit that determines whether or not a print job still exists in the printing apparatus, and a responding unit that either transmits information indicating that a cancelation request has been received, or **transmits error information** in the case where it has been determined that **the print job does not exist in the printing apparatus**.

Instead, Matsueda discloses a print control apparatus intended to provide for the reliable canceling of print jobs “even when the job to be cancelled is not in the printer due to an overflow” (paragraph [0008]). Matsueda explains that an issue that can arise with printers can be that a print job entered into a printer may not be stored in a job management area inside the printer because “the upper limit on the number of jobs that the printer can hold at one time has been exceeded” (paragraph [0006]). Matsueda further clarifies that “[j]obs that are not stored in the printer’s management area cannot be seen from the printing system, either, and as a result such as print job cannot be canceled” (paragraph [0006]). In other words, Matsueda seeks to resolve the issue where a print job cannot be canceled because it has not yet entered a job management area inside the printer.

To that end, Matsueda teaches a print control apparatus having an acquisition unit to acquire print job status and a deletion control unit, where the deletion control unit “uses the print job status information to determine whether or not the print job designated can be deleted and cancels the print job designated for cancellation once it is determined that the print job can be deleted” (paragraph [0009]). Thus, the apparatus of Matsueda is configured to check the status of a print job that is to be deleted, and then perform deletion of the print

job once it is determined that deletion can be done, for example, once the print job has entered a printer management area of the printer.

However, Matsueda does not teach or suggest a printing apparatus having a unit that transmits error response information in relation to a determination that a print job no longer exists in the printing apparatus, as in the instant claim. Instead, as shown for example in Figure 8 and described in paragraphs [0077]-[0083], the apparatus of Matsueda checks whether a print job is in the process of being entered or has already been entered into the printer (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0081]-[0082] and S83, S84 of Figure 8). If the print job has already been entered (*e.g.*, the print job exists in a job management area of a printer as opposed to in the printer buffer), then a job cancel command is issued to the printer (*see, e.g.*, paragraph [0081]), whereas if the print job is merely in the process of being entered (*e.g.*, is in the printer buffer or other area but not yet in the job management area of the printer), then the invention of Matsueda allows for the status of the print job is set as “to be cancelled” such that the print job is deleted as soon as it becomes possible to do so (*see, e.g.*, paragraphs [0082]-[0083]).

Thus, Matsueda is concerned with cancelling print jobs within a print management area in a printer, or setting a status of print jobs that have entered a printer but not yet entered the print management as “to be canceled,” such that the print jobs are canceled upon entering the print management area. Matsueda does not teach or suggest determining whether a print job does or does not exist in a printing apparatus (*e.g.*, whether the print job has already been printed), and transmitting error response information in the case where a request for canceling a print job is received for such a print job that no longer exists in the printing apparatus. In other words, Matsueda is concerned with tracking and setting cancellation status of print jobs entering a printer, but does not teach or suggest an apparatus whereby a user could be notified that a print job has exited the printer, *e.g.*, by completion of the print job, by the transmission of error response

information in response to a cancellation request for a print job that is no longer in the printing apparatus (e.g., has been printed). Accordingly, as Matsueda does not teach or suggest the printing apparatus having the determining unit and responding unit that determine whether a print job still exists in the printing apparatus, and transmit error response information if the print job does not still exist when a request for cancellation of the print job has been made, as in the instantly claimed apparatus, it is considered that Matsueda does not anticipate the printing apparatus as claimed.

The fact that Matsueda does not teach or suggest transmitting information indicating that the cancellation of the job cannot be performed when the printing process of the job is completed and the job thus does not exist in the printer, is further verified by closer examination of the process flow chart shown in Figure 8 of Matsueda. In particular, as shown in this Figure, Matsueda discloses that in the case where the server 202 receives the job cancellation request from a client 201, if a status of the job is "entry completed" in step S84, the server 202 issues the job cancellation request to the printer 231 in step S85. However, if the job does not exist in the printer 231 because the printing process is completed, the server 202 merely waits for a response from the printer in step S86. In other words, the server 202 does not receive, from the printer 231, information indication that the cancellation of the job cannot be performed, and the user is thus unable to know this fact.

It is furthermore noted that in Matsueda, the device for receiving the job cancellation request (i.e., the server 202) is not the same as the device for storing the job to be canceled by the job cancellation request (i.e., the printer 231.) Thus, there may be a time lag between when the printer 231 notifies the server 202 of the changing status of the job, and when the server 202 actually changed the status of the job managed using a job management table. Therefore, in the case where the client 201 issues the job cancellation request to the server 202, if the server 202 has not yet changed the status of the job in the

printer 231, the client 201 may not be able to identify the correct status of the job for which the job cancellation request has been issued.

In contrast, in embodiments of the instant invention, an apparatus for receiving a request for canceling a job may be the same as that for storing a job to be canceled by the request. In other words, the printing apparatus may be configured to both receive the request for canceling the job, and to store the job that is to be canceled by the request. Therefore, a time lag between when the printing apparatus receives the request for canceling the job and when the printing apparatus confirms whether or not the job specified in the request exists may be smaller than if such functions were performed by separate apparatuses, such as the separate server 202 and printer 231 of Matsueda. Thus, the user can more accurately know the correct status of the job for which the job cancellation request has been issued.

Accordingly, Matsueda does not teach a printing apparatus that determines whether a specified print job still exists in the printing apparatus, and transmits error response information in the case where a request for cancellation has been made for a specified print job that does not still exist, as in claim 1, and thus the reference does not anticipate the claim. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Matsueda is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and thus are also not anticipated by Matsueda for at least the same reasons as their base claim. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Matsueda is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is drawn to a method of canceling a print job in a print apparatus comprising, *inter alia*:

“receiving, from an information processing system, **a request for canceling the print job** received by the printing apparatus” (emphasis added);

“determining whether the print job specified in the received request still exists in the printing apparatus” (emphasis added);

“transmitting response information indicating that the request for canceling the print job has been received to the information processing system as a response to the request for cancelling the print job” (emphasis added); and

“transmitting error response information to the information processing system as a response to the request for canceling the print job **in a case where it is determined that the print job specified in the request does not exist in the printing apparatus**” (emphasis added).

Thus, similarly to claim 1, the method of claim 6 requires determining whether a specified print job exists in a printing apparatus (e.g., whether or not the printing of the print job has been completed), and transmitting error response information if a request for canceling of the specified print job is received but the print job no longer exists in the printing apparatus (e.g., the print job has already been printed). As discussed above, Matsueda does not teach or suggest transmitting an error response if a print job no longer exists in a printing apparatus, and instead is concerned with cancelling print jobs that are still pending. Accordingly, claim 6 is not anticipated by Matsueda, and claims 7-9 depending therefrom are similarly not anticipated for at least the same reasons as their base claim. Thus, the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Matsueda is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claim 10 is drawn to a computer-readable medium that stores computer-executable program for canceling a print job in a printing apparatus, where the computer readable medium comprises, *inter alia*:

“a code to receive, from an information processing system, a request for canceling the print job received by the printing apparatus” (emphasis added);

“a code to determine whether the print job specified in the received request still exists in the printing apparatus” (emphasis added);

“a code to transmit response information indicating whether the request for canceling the print job has been received to the information processing system as a response to the request for canceling the print job” (emphasis added); and

“a code to transmit error response information to the information processing system as a response to the request for canceling the print job in a case where it is determined that the print job does not exist in the printing apparatus” (emphasis added).

Accordingly, similarly to claims 1 and 6, the computer-readable medium of claim 10 requires that the program code determine whether a specified print job exists in a printing apparatus (e.g., whether or not the printing of the print job has been completed), and transmit error response information if a request for canceling of the specified print job is received but the print job no longer exists in the printing apparatus (e.g., the print job has already been printed), and thus is not anticipated by Matsueda for at least those reasons discussed for claim 1 and 6 above. Thus, the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Matsueda is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims pending in the application meet the requirements for patentability and respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate the allowance of such claims.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this response which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account Number 502456. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner may contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

2008-10-29

/Abigail Cotton/

Date

Abigail Cotton, Reg. No. 52,773
Patent Agent for Applicant

Canon U.S.A. Inc., Intellectual Property Division
15975 Alton Parkway
Irvine, CA 92618-3731

Telephone: (949) 932-3351
Fax: (949) 932-3560